

--9--

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10, 32-41, and 52-63 are currently pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 32 and 52 are amended for the Examiner's consideration. The above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. For example, support for the amendments is provided at Fig. 2D and paragraphs [0027] – [0034] of the instant published application No. 2005/0043977. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephonic interview with Applicant's representative, which was conducted on September 9, 2009. During the interview, the rejection of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as well as the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) were discussed. In response to Applicant's representative's proposal to clarify the claims to more clearly define the goals, values, capabilities and resources, the Examiner noted that the hierarchical relationship shown in FIG. 2D of the instant application did not appear to be disclosed or suggested by the applied art and that if the claims were properly amended to recite such features as are shown in FIG. 2D, such an amendment would advance prosecution and the prior art rejection might be overcome. The Examiner noted, however, that such an amendment would advance prosecution and require an RCE for entry and consideration after Final. The

--10--

Examiner also agreed to contact Applicant's representative after receiving Applicant's response if minor changes are required to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant notes that while Applicant has amended each of the independent claims substantially as proposed in the Interview, Applicant is not conceding in this application that these claims, prior to the instant amendment, are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of possible allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10, 32-41 and 52-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, for being indefinite allegedly because there is no apparent recited relationship between the goal, value, capability and resource in the claims. Although Applicant believes that the claims are in full compliance with Section 112, 2nd paragraph, Applicant has nonetheless amended each of the independent claims to recite a relationship between the noted elements in order to advance prosecution. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of the above-noted claims be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10, 32-41 and 52-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0198727 issued to Ann, *et al.* ("ANN") in

--11--

view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046130 issued to Golightly, *et al.* ("GOLIGHTLY") and in further view of "Reference Architectures for Enterprise Integration" by Chalmeta ("CHALMETA"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that claims 1, 32 and 52 have been amended consistent with the discussion in the Telephone Interview of September 9, 2009 in an effort to advance prosecution and in a manner which is believed to overcome this rejection. It was agreed that Applicant would clarify the claims so as to possibly resolve this basis of rejection.

Applicant reiterates the arguments already made of record regarding ANN and submits that ANN also fails to teach or suggest, among other things, displaying on a graphic user interface (GUI) the hierarchical relationship between the goal, the value associated with the goal, the capability representing critical functions for ensuring delivery of the value, and one or more resources for enabling the capability. Indeed, the Examiner agreed in the above-noted telephone interview that such recited features do not appear to be shown in ANN.

The newly cited references to GOLIGHTLY and CHALMETA, while teaching to utilize a display (see, e.g., Fig. 4A of GOLIGHTLY), do not appear to teach or suggest displaying on a graphic user interface (GUI) the hierarchical relationship between the goal, the value associated with the goal, the capability representing critical functions for ensuring delivery of the value, and one or more resources for enabling the capability. Indeed, the Examiner agreed in the above-noted telephone interview that such recited features are not shown in GOLIGHTLY and CHALMETA.

--12--

Finally, Applicant submits that the above-noted dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims 1, 32 and 52.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed. Applicant hereby makes a written conditional petition for extension of time, if required. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Respectfully submitted,
Marybeth AHERN, et al.



Andrew M. Calderon
Registration No. 38,093

Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone: 703-716-1191
Facsimile: 703-716-1180